

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application. All of the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Boucher. None of the claims is currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office states that Applicant's previously submitted arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection based on Boucher. In particular, the Office suggests that Boucher teaches the independent processors for different protocols at column 7, lines 1-5.¹ Following study of the cited passage, Applicant concludes that Boucher actually teaches away from the previously argued limitation of dedicating processors to particular protocols. Note that Boucher states "the custom designed network microprocessor can have independent processors for transmitting and receiving network information, and further processors for assisting and queuing."² Neither transmitting, nor receiving, nor assisting, nor queuing are functions exclusively associated with a single protocol according to Boucher. Boucher goes on to state that "a preferred microprocessor embodiment includes a pipelined trio of receive, transmit and utility processors."³ Neither receive, nor transmit, nor utility functions are exclusively associated with a single protocol. Further, most protocols would make use of such functions, so the pipelined trio of processors would be multi-protocol. Consequently, Boucher does not teach the limitation of "a first routing processor exclusively associated with a first routing protocol for determining a set of routes, and a second routing processor exclusively associated with a second routing protocol for determining a set of routes" recited in claim 1. Claims 9 and 14 recite similar language, and claims 2-8, 10-13, and 15-19 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and

¹ OA at page 3

² col. 6, line 67 through col. 7, line 4

which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-19 based on Boucher is therefore requested.

For the reasons stated above, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

July 31, 2006
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-475
Dd: 8/15/2006

³ col. 7, lines 4-5